

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

UNITED NATIONS PLAZA AT 40TH STREET NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017 CABLE ADDRESS INTERPAZ OXFORD 7-5121

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

24 June 1968

7

TO: U.S. participants in the Bilderberg meeting at Mont Tremblant
FROM: Joseph E. Johnson

I am enclosing herewith copies of the remarks by Dr. Perkins
and Mr. Moyers at Mont Tremblant, as edited by them.

RECEIVED
JUN 25 1968
MR. ROBERT MURPHY

Notice: This material may be protected by copyright law
(Title 17, U.S. Code). This copy may not be further
reproduced or distributed without the specific
authorization of the Hoover Institution Archives,
Stanford, CA 94305-6010.

BILDERBERG MEETING

Mont Tremblant, Canada

REMARKS BY DR. JAMES A. PERKINS

27 April 1968

My remarks, unlike Gaul, divide into four parts: I will make four disclaimers, five not so brief observations, four brief conclusions; and I will end with a proverb.

Let me hasten to the disclaimers. First of all, the topic of the student is all too timely. I read in the newspapers that in various parts of the world there are a million students involved in one way or another in protests, confrontations, and strikes. My own sister university in the Ivy League, Columbia, is in the same kind of toils that afflicted Berkeley some few years ago. France is in the agony of a general student rebellion; Germany and Italy have their problems; and so do many universities in the Southern hemisphere. So the topic is almost too hot.

My second disclaimer is that I know that there are enormous differences between countries. While my own view is perhaps parochial in the sense that I speak from the base of the United States in general and my own university, Cornell, in particular, my parochialism has been somewhat tempered by an opportunity in the last ten or fifteen years to visit a good many universities around the world.

Finally, I will not deal here with particular cases or particular tactics and strategies for maintaining order in the university. Instead I am going to try to present to you what seems to me to be the underlying causes of the unrest found in the student population around the world.

Now let me turn to my five observations. The first is that the problems I want to lay before you tonight are not student problems as such, but are rather problems of students as members of a new "pre-adult class" that has been dangerously detached from its adult parentage. We must focus our attention on this pre-adult world in general if we would understand the student in particular.

My second observation. Let me say a few things about what I call the pre-adult class. This is an age group roughly between 15 and 25. Because of demographic developments, this group represents a very substantial fraction of our population. These young people have had a far earlier individual freedom than most of us ever experienced. On the other hand, members of this group acquire adult responsibility later and later as education and training require more and more years of preparation.

The second characteristic of this pre-adult group, as I have indicated, is that it is detached from the adult world to a degree we are only beginning to understand. There are many reasons. Family ties have loosened. Parents are more mobile. Most of these young people have grown up in urban circumstances, where family cohesion is neither so important nor so possible as it is in rural life.

But of all the factors that distinguish these young people -- their early freedom, late responsibility, and detachment from the adult world -- perhaps the most salient is the fact that their high motives and genuine idealism have not been tempered by adult contact. As a result, they have not seen how idealism must be modified in life by experience. In other times a young man learned this by watching his parents wrestle with the difference between what they wanted and what they could have. A recent statement which may seem amusing -- it does to me -- and perhaps tragic is, nevertheless, characteristic of this age. It was written by the editor of

a university newspaper. He said quite solemnly in his editorial, "Only the young can be truly moral because they, and they alone, are not contaminated by experience."

We must remember, however, that perhaps 80 per cent of this pre-adult class still live and behave in what I would call traditional modes. They are not involved in the exercises I am about to describe. Most of them run their own course and live more or less the way you and I did. Most have some profession in mind and look forward to the time when they can get jobs, raise families, and become part of society. About 15 per cent are concerned, but not active; sensitive, worried, troubled by the world they see ahead of them, but not committed to involvement in efforts to force immediate or abrupt changes.

About one to three per cent are in the activist wing. They divide into two groups: those who would change society to conform to their own vigorous ideas and those who believe that society is not worth changing and must be destroyed. Another one to three per cent have given up. Their characters may be too weak. They may not have strong enough moral fiber because of background or family circumstance (a lot of them come from broken homes). These young people have left the battle and gone off into the dream world provided by drugs and other forms of escapism.

My third observation. This pre-adult group can be almost uniquely described as one that has both the highest expectations and the highest frustrations.

Their high expectations are part and parcel of the revolution that sometime within the last five years has moved from rising expectations to rising demands.

Many of these young people believe that we can have the kind of world we want if we would just try.

It is a view that has been fed by political leaders who have promised, in order both to achieve and stay in office, the prospect of heaven on earth. It has been fueled by church leaders who seem to have abandoned their interest in heaven for more earthly objectives. (We have not yet been able, by the way, to assess the consequences for human motivation of this abandonment of life hereafter.)

The view that all is possible here and now has also been prompted by a belief that science and technology can move man as easily as mountains. If it is relatively simple to rearrange one's environment, so the analogy goes, it should be just as easy to rearrange society. Of course, the analogy is inaccurate and false. Finally, this age group has lived in the closed circuit of an internal culture that feeds on its own assumptions and conclusions. These assumptions in turn, have been spread throughout this culture by mass media that have seemed at times only too anxious to serve it.

And now for the frustrations. These young people, particularly the activists, have the obvious problem that arises when ideals must be put into practice. There are, however, some young people who don't even know that this is a problem -- for the very reason that they have been detached from those who must daily adjust prospects to practicalities.

A second frustration arises particularly in those countries which have strong authoritarian governments, but which nevertheless permit enough elbow room in their societies so that people can protest. At least they may protest on the campus without being jailed, a circumstance somewhat typical

under many Latin-American dictatorships, where the student group has replaced the absent political opposition and has become the party on the outs.

But even in democratic countries that have wide majorities, particularly majorities that embrace the center, there is a good deal of instability at the wings, both right and left. It is a macabre note indeed that two countries which have recently achieved large electoral support for their heads of state, the United States and Germany, have experienced some of the greatest difficulties, I think for the reasons I have just mentioned. We were talking the other night about President Johnson having been elected in 1964 with the largest electoral majority in history, only to discover that it was his fate to be faced with more extremism rather than less. The reason is perhaps obvious: when you have a majority that covers a wide spectrum of your political life, those who are on the active wing find the rest of the world substantially ranged against them. They believe there is such a mass of support behind the government in power that prospects of change are impossible.

But there is a deeper and more fundamental frustration with which this age group must cope. There are, typically speaking, five or six institutions which this pre-adult class can look to as instruments of change: government, the church, the corporation, the labor union, the political party, and the university. These levers of power--and if I say anything I hope you'll remember, it is this--now represent to the pre-adult group the current establishment. We who were brought up in the 'twenties and 'thirties rather thought of the government and labor unions as the great driving forces that were going to produce the new society and the social change we hoped for. Today the average member of this

class looks to every one of these six symbols of organized society as being not only essentially conservative rather than progressive, but concerned with the maintenance of the status quo rather than with change. Only two in this group now appeal to this pre-adult class as instruments it is worthwhile to work with -- the church and the university.

The university becomes a particular focal point for young people, partly because they now know -- and the universities have told them so with some care -- that in this present period knowledge and trained manpower are the most important levers for the development of societies everywhere. Therefore, of all the possible instruments of change, the university has become for young people the most crucial.

This leads me to my fourth observation. That the university should be the main hope for the expression of the ideas of young people is a very natural thing. The university is the one institution of which most of them are members. They are not members of the corporation, or the government bureau, or the labor union, or the political party. Most of them are below voting age. Many of them feel not only that the doors are shut, but that they would not be asked to participate even if they invite themselves in.

The university is, therefore, the obvious focus of attention. It is the only accessible lever for change, and it is the one place where young people feel they are in touch with the establishment. No other social unit provides this pre-adult group access on any continuing basis to the adult world.

Young people use the University in three ways as a lever of change -- first, through the administration of the university and its connections with the other organizations they want to influence. They believe -- and correctly so, when it comes to the United States in particular -- that the university has joined forces with government and industry to form a great web of power and influence in the management of modern society.

Having come to believe that, they see the university and its connections with government, on the one hand, and industry on the other, as a point d'appui, a place where they can translate thought into action.

A second way they can influence the establishment through the campus is by the pressure they are able to exert, or think they can exert, on those visitors from the establishment who come to the university to lecture or visit. If you would like chapter and verse, my good friend here, Robert McNamara, can tell you what I mean. When Secretary Rusk arrived on the Cornell campus last year, many ~~students were asking themselves, "How can we morally remain quiet when this~~ may be the only opportunity we have to register with the Secretary of State our views on the war in Vietnam?" The campus auditorium is the student equivalent of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations! The students don't see why Senator Fulbright should have all the fun.

The third way they can affect the establishment is by using the relative protection of a society from which they can emerge to deal with social problems that exist outside the university. The planning for the student civil rights activity in the South was organized on campus because the students were in close enough communication with each other to make these plans effective.

But the university has advantages and disadvantages for those who would use it as a lever of change. The university is, almost by definition, an open and permissive society. It was organized on the central assumption that its affairs would be governed by reason rather than force, and this assumption so pervades the very idea of the university, that it is possible for those who would resort to means other than reason to have a field day.

Second, the university has deep traditions of autonomy from the very society that supports it. It is a delicate arrangement; it suggests that the public support an institution which in turn will use some considerable part of its energies and efforts to criticize society itself. This combination of factors -- openness, permissiveness, the assumption of reason, and deep traditions of autonomy -- makes it particularly difficult to maintain law and order on a campus when both its autonomy and its freedom have been challenged by force. Force may require the university to admit that its own community cannot govern itself by reason and persuasion -- an admission most universities are reluctant to make.

A majority of the students and faculty, as I have indicated earlier, are not involved in most of these exercises about which we read. They probably cannot be involved. Individual independence as a guiding principle in the management of the university is strong, the university management has great difficulty in appealing to the 80 per cent I described. These people are not able to give up a long tradition of independence for both the faculty and the student.

They are unwilling to give up their individual independence for a variety of

reasons. For one thing, the faculty and the university have been organized on the principle that whatever a professor says in the classroom is his business. Furthermore, in recent years independence has allowed most faculty to become both more mobile and more worldly and to involve themselves more in research and public service activities. All of these things have taken the faculty even further from their traditional role as managers of the university community. The result is that university-wide concerns have been progressively surrendered by faculties as a whole. They have been replaced, where they have been replaced at all, by increased responsibilities on the part of department chairmen and administration.

The universities are a special example, then, of the advantage that a minority has when it threatens violence in the middle of an open society. This is true in any democracy. Local would-be dictators have threatened the democratic style in the United States on several occasions. But democracies operate like coiled springs, which can be pushed only so far. Dictators and authoritarians of every stripe have always underestimated the potential democratic recoil. Universities also have internal recoil systems. Pushed too far, they may be forced to change from administrative and organizational anarchy to a kind of discipline unfamiliar to the current academic scene. So far, the majority of both students and faculty have not yet been frightened enough by the prospect of violence from the minority to change the style of university government that is so much a part of the academic tradition of the western world.

Observation Number 5. The pre-adult world is in part a reflection of some of the deep problems that exist in the adult world. Let me describe them. Many

adults believe that their world has lost a good deal of its direction and purpose. The adult world -- also known as "the establishment" or "the system" -- seems to be more preoccupied with managing the apparatus than with the human values that apparatus was presumably designed to serve. Adults do often become concerned more with means than with ends. When people like Adlai Stevenson come along, who seem to be able to speak about ends as well as means, they have an instantaneous following.

Another characteristic of the adult world is that for many years it has cared more about private morality than public standards. We have tended to preach a good deal about individual behavior, but we shy away from moral valuations of public conduct -- by the corporation, the Congress, the university, and other large institutions of society. The young have watched this process and have learned more from what we adults do than from what we say. They have seen that while we preach against individual moral aberration, we practise it widely. They have decided that high standards of public conduct are more important, and so have not only taken on the large issues of war and peace, the equality of man, the plight of the poor, the social purpose of large institutions, and the idea of a well-knit community -- but have also made their commitment to these issues part and parcel of their personal morality.

Young people believe, I'm afraid with some justice, that they have borrowed their styles and tastes from the adult world. Pornography is manufactured by adults, not by the young. ~~Wherever one looks, the papers and the~~ newspapers, film, books, television. Wherever one looks, the papers and the advertisements sometimes are enough to make one ill.

We then must look at the adult world a bit. We are defenders of our own revolution. Those of us who survived the Depression and two world wars have, we believe, done a great deal to marry up the interests of government, of the educational and intellectual world, and the business world in a way that allows for a balance and interplay of which, in my judgment, we may be justly proud. We are shocked, at least I am, to discover that what were considered to be the successes of my generation are precisely the cause of concern of the next. The young view this as an unholy alliance, a new establishment so pervasive that they find it difficult to know how to deal with it. We

I would also urge that we keep a very sensitive ear to the concerns that lie

It seems to me that all institutions -- church, government, labor union, corporation, political party, or university -- should become once again, at least in part, instruments of change and progress. They must also learn all over again to look upon the processes of change as exciting. One of the things we have done is to convince the young that we are rather bored with what we are about. We get off the commuter train and arrive home to tell our children what a dreadful day we have had. We come back from our trips, and instead of talking about the exciting things we learned, we require everyone in the house to be quiet because we are so tired from our travels. We talk about the deadly routine of the office, and we have no idea how unconsciously we have led the new generation to believe that not only are we an establishment, but an establishment that isn't even having very much

Notice: This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17, U.S. Code). This copy may not be further reproduced or distributed without the specific authorization of the Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, CA 94305-6010.

Private:
Not for Publication
or Quotation

BILDERBERG MEETING
MONT TREMBLANT, CANADA

Remarks by Bill D. Moyers
27 April 1968

Your Royal Highness,

I assume I was asked to do this because of my years of close association with the President. However, I must admit that I do not have any special intelligence. Mr. Ball and Mr. McNamara have been closer in the last year to the President than I have and what I am about to say is really my opinion based upon my years with the President and the deduction of certain evidence that I have seen in print and heard from friends.

I am not, of course, without prejudice. You cannot work as closely as I did with a man and not feel some sense of pride in his finer moments. I must also say that Mr. Johnson is one of the more inscrutable men I have known and it would be only a fool's effort to try to say that this or that reason was a more weighted factor in the confluence of rivers of influence at which he made up his mind.

There was no single issue; there were several: personal, political and patriotic.

At the personal level I have no doubt that the five years Mr. Johnson has spent in the White House have taken their toll. His health was and is good, but he is obviously a weary man. You can run the hundred yards dash once a week or once a month for years and not feel the result but you cannot run the hundred yards dash once or twice a day without ~~feeling the result~~. ~~And even so, it is~~

a little slower. Mr. Johnson was a weary man.

He was also a wounded man. I recognize that the popular image of the President portrays him as a tough man of iron and steel, but in fact, and I suspect that both Mr. McNamara and Mr. Ball agree with this, Lyndon Johnson is one of the most sensitive men I have ever known. Sensitive to the need for understanding even when he does not give understanding and sensitive to the human desire for affection, even when he is not himself very affectionate.

Whether you agree with his policy or not, if you follow the American scene closely I think you would agree that the President has been subjected to one of the most virulent and bitter campaigns of vilification in American political history. Much of it the President recognized as the normal bad behaviour of political enemies and also from the fact that, as he has known over thirty years of political struggle, extremists do not have good manners. But the abuse became increasingly vitriolic, increasingly personal and always persistent. How long can you tolerate being called "a murderer" and a "liar" in public? I think the President decided that he had absorbed all his system could take and all that in the interest of his own family's state of mind, he should take. I think those were the personal factors. There were others of course.

On the political level he knew that he was in trouble. He is a politician and he saw his own political strength slipping away. If there is anything worse than being "out of power", it is being "in power without power" and the President saw that his power was draining away. The Democratic party was in a state of serious disarray, partly because of the debate on Vietnam, partly because of the challenge from Senators Kennedy and McCarthy, and partly because, contrary to the popular myth, the President is not a very partisan politician. That is, he never did take the time to build up his party.

~~Fewer political appointments were made in this administration than in any other~~ American administration in my memory. To my knowledge the President refused to permit the party, as has been done in the past, to use defence contracts to bolster the supporters in the States. He certainly never took a very sustained interest in building a strong partisan, Democratic party. He never has become a very partisan man. His national ground, as I say, was shrinking away. He continued and he continues to believe in the propriety and the necessity and, I think the ultimate vindication of his policy in Vietnam, but he could not persuade a majority of Americans in its propriety and in its necessity, and in the end he finally lost his majority on what had become the most crucial, the single most fundamental issue in American political life of today: the war in Vietnam. And as a result of this he lost control of events. He could not deal with them credibly because people had stopped believing him. Everything he did was looked upon as a politically device.

Then the results of the New Hampshire primary gave him less than a clear majority. On Friday before he announced the decision, although I am personally convinced now that he had made the decision before that Sunday - but on Friday before he announced his decision, he saw privately what became public only later, and that is that the Gallup poll had shown him dropping to the lowest public standing in his presidency. Now he is a very proud man. In 1964 he received the largest plurality an American President ever received in an election. He did not want to be one of the very few Presidents in American history to have been denied renomination. That would undermine that plurality of 1964. He was faced, even

if he sought re-nomination and got it, with a narrow margin of victory after a very bitter struggle. And finally, and perhaps more importantly in his present thinking than any of the other issues that I have mentioned so far, he asked himself the question "even if I win, can I govern?" And there was a very real doubt in his mind and others that re-election would lead or increase his ability to govern. So much for the political argument.

Finally the patriotic purposes. It is difficult for me, without being accused of sycophancy - it is difficult for me to exaggerate just how deeply the man feels about his country. Unity is not a cliché with him; it is a political philosophy with him. I think that is why President Eisenhower, a Republican, found Lyndon Johnson his strongest ally in a Democratically controlled congress. The President came from a region of this country which has suffered for one hundred years because of an act of disunity. The South saw disunity and disunion, and he has seen in his life-time what happens when the country is not unified, the consequences of division. In 1963, as those of you who watched those days of transition will recall, the President had one single ambition. As he himself said: "I want to unify this country, the religions, the races, etc.". Now he found the country more divided than ever, and in an ironic twist of American life the personality of the man who sought to unify the country had become the chief cause of the country's division. He felt it necessary to remove himself in order to make unity possible again. He had become by his own judgment the core and the centre of controversy. People were debating not Lyndon Johnson's policy as much as they were debating Lyndon Johnson's personality. To get the debate on a more rational plane, to tame the emotions

about Vietnam, to release the political poison that had invaded our system, the President felt he should remove himself as an issue.

And finally I think he did this because he felt he had to convince the world and Hanoi in particular that he truly wanted a political settlement in Vietnam; that his March 31 offer was a sincere gesture and not just a ploy of a politically ambitious President trying to pull the rug out from under Bobby Kennedy. There are men in this room who used to say to the President "stop the bombing, stop the bombing", who made the argument that this might be the only way "you can convince the Communists of your sincerity." And the President used to say: "well it is easy for you to say that, but I am responsible for the lives of those men out there, and I cannot stop the bombing just to convince the other side that I am sincere". And so now he has decided that he would not at the risk of their lives but at the cost of his own political career try to convince Hanoi that he is sincere.

I do not know whether time will prove that he was right or wrong on these or other policies and I certainly doubt that his critics will concede him the kind of lofty motives that I do, but I believe him. The President used to say that he valued peace in Asia more than life itself but he also used to say that the wrong kind of peace would be worse than death itself. I think only history will prove if he were right to pursue a course that in the end cost him his political future.